

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, dated September 22, 2004, the Examiner states that Claims 1-17 are pending, Claims 1-17 are rejected. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the claims.

In the Office Action, Claims 4, 5, 10, 12, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Applicant has amended the claims to remove the indefiniteness. The claims have not been amended for any reason relating to patentability in view of the cited prior art.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-6, 12, 13, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ballin (US 3,955,790). Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballin in view of Brock (US 2,527,982). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses these rejections.

Independent Claim 1 recites "a hook member disposed at each end of the horizontal arm, said hook member including an opening ..." In Ballin the hook members are not located at each end, and the hook members do not include an opening. Instead, the hook members are disposed on the arm away from the ends, and the openings are provided in the arm, not in the hook members, as claimed.

Similarly, with regard to independent Claim 13, there is no disclosure of a hook member having a hanger portion disposed above an opening. Also, with regard to Claims 2, 11 and 14, the cited references, specifically US 3,955,790, do not disclose the openings at each end (which are in the arm and not a part of the hook member as claimed) being disposed below the hanger portion of the hook member.

With regard to Claim 4 and 16, there is no disclosure of an opening in the references that direct a fastener inward and slightly downward.

With regard to Claims 8 and 14, there is no disclosure in the references of a second opening, let alone a first opening, in the hook member.

3

With regard to Claim 9, there is no disclosure in the references of additional removable hook members.


For at least these reasons, the Applicant considers that the features in the claims are not disclosed by the cited prior art, and the rejections thus overcome.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

March 22, 2005

Date



Attorney for Applicant  
Brian W. Hameder  
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 427-1300  
Reg. No. 45613